



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,602	09/15/2003	Chang-Ning Huang	M61.12-0514	2369
27366 7590 12/14/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
SAINT CYR, LEONARD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,602

Applicant(s)

HUANG ET AL.

Examiner

LEONARD SAINT CYR

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47, 55, 56, 63 - 65, and 67 - 71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47, 55, 56, 63 - 65, and 67 - 71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09/15/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/03/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the statistics generated in the Palmer reference have nothing to do with quantifying a level of precision with which word type indications have been applied (Amendment, page 8).

The examiner disagrees, since Palmer disclose **"In scoring segmentation using algorithm, recall is defined as the percentage of actual words from the hand-segmented text identified in the corresponding positions in the text, while precision is defined as the percentage of identified words which are also in the same positions in the hand-segmented text. The NMSU segmenter consists of an initial approximation followed by a sequence of iterative refinements...to recognize idiomatic expressions, derived words, Chinese person names, and foreign proper names.** It will be interesting to determine the contribution of each of these to the segmentation accuracy as well as the retrieval score. **Similarly, it may be helpful to use frequency-based phrase building, that is, segmentation based on character n-gram occurrences** in the collection" (page 176, col.2; page 177; col.2).

Applicants argue that neither Palmer et al., nor Dien et al., morphological output as claimed that includes an affixation type indication of a plural affix applied to a noun (Amendment, page 9).

The examiner disagrees, since Dien et al., disclose **“those are the words morphologically derived...Similar to English, there appear also prefixes and suffixes, which are however much simpler in the morphology of Vietnamese. Therefore, we apply further morphological analysis to easily identify this class of words.** The critical point here is to determine the weight of these derived words” [section 4.1.5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Palmer et al., (Chinese Word Segmentation and Information Retrieval; 1997).

As per claims 47, and 57, Palmer et al., teach a computer-implemented method for evaluating a word segmentation language model, comprising:

building the word segmentation language model based on an annotated corpus (“segmentation based on character bigrams”; page 175, col.2, paragraph 1; page 177, col.2, paragraph 5);

utilizing a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer to apply the language model to a test corpus of unsegmented text different from the

annotated corpus so as to provide an output indicative of words in the test corpus and a word type indication for each word, the word type indication being any one of a plurality of word type indications ("**refinement steps attempt to recognize idiomatic expressions, derived words, Chinese person names, and foreign proper names**" those are considered as word type indications; pages 177, col.2, paragraph 3);

utilizing the processor to compare the word type indication for each word in the output of the language model with predefined word type indications of words of the test corpus; and utilizing the processor to automatically generate a quantitative value that represents a level of precision with which word type indications were applied in the output indicative of words in the test corpus ("precision is defined as the percentage of identified words which are also in the same positions in the hand-segmented text... **refinement steps attempt to recognize idiomatic expressions, derived words, Chinese person names, and foreign proper names**, determine the contribution of each of these steps to the segmentation accuracy"; page 176, col.2, paragraph 5; pages 177, col.2, paragraph 3);

wherein generating comprises generating based on how frequently ("**it may be helpful to use frequency-based phrase building, that is, segmentation based on character n-gram occurrences**") location name type indications ("proper names") for words in the output match identical corresponding predefined location name indications assigned to the same words in the test corpus, and wherein generating comprises generating not based simply on the words in the output themselves but also generating based on a comparison involving the location name types assigned to words in the

output, each location name being a data descriptor that is separate and distinct from a word in the output to which it is assigned (**"precision is defined as the percentage of identified words which are also in the same positions in the hand-segmented text. The NMSU segmenter consists of an initial approximation followed by a sequence of iterative refinements...to recognize idiomatic expressions, derived words, Chinese person names, and foreign proper names"**; page 176, col.2; page 177; col.2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 55, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al., (Chinese Word Segmentation and Information Retrieval; 1997) in view of Haizhou et al., (Chinese Word Segmentation, 1998).

As per claims 55, 56, Palmer et al., do not specifically teach that overlapping ambiguous string word type indications were applied in the output; organization name word type indications were applied in the output; covering ambiguous string word type indications were applied in the output.

Haizhou et al., teach As indicated by Liang[2], there are two cases of unexpected segmentation. One is overlapping ambiguity where a character could go either way to form two words, such as in example 1. Another is composition ambiguity where the subsegmentation is possible:...One can find that , and all are possible word entries,

thus both results are valid based on lexicon entries (page 215, section 3.2, paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made use overlapping ambiguous string word and covering ambiguous string word in precision scores as taught by Haizhou et al., in Palmer et al., because that would contribute to the segmentation accuracy (Palmer et al., page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

6. Claims 63, 64, 67- 69, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al., (Chinese Word Segmentation and Information Retrieval; 1997) in view of Dien et al., (Vietnamese Word Segmentation, 2001).

As per claim 63, Palmer et al., teach a computer-implemented method for performing word segmentation, the method comprising:

receiving an input of unsegmented text; utilizing a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer to apply a language model so as to determine a segmentation of the unsegmented text ("segmentation based on character bigrams"; page 175, col.2, paragraph 1; page 177, col.2, paragraph 5);

identifying a morphologically derived word within the unsegmented text; and providing an output that includes the segmentation of the unsegmented text ("derived words...to the segmentation accuracy"; page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

However, Palmer et al., do not specifically teach an indication of a combination of parts that form the morphologically derived word, the output also including an indication

of a part of speech for the combination of parts, and the output also including an indication that the morphological derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent with a morphological pattern of an affixation type.

Dien et al., teach that **those are the words morphologically derived**...Similar to English, **there appear also prefixes and suffixes, which are however much simpler in the morphology of Vietnamese. Therefore, we apply further morphological analysis to easily identify this class of words.** The critical point here is to determine the weight of these derived words [section 4.1.5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made use indication of a combination of parts that form derived words as taught by Dien et al., in Palmer et al., because that would contribute to the segmentation accuracy (Palmer et al., page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

As per claim 68, Palmer et al., teach a computer-implemented method for performing word segmentation, the method comprising:

receiving an input of unsegmented text; utilizing a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer to apply a language model so as to determine a segmentation of the unsegmented text ("segmentation based on character bigrams"; page 175, col.2, paragraph 1; page 177, col.2, paragraph 5);

identifying a morphologically derived word within the unsegmented text; and providing an output that includes the segmentation of the unsegmented text ("derived words...to the segmentation accuracy"; page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

However, Palmer et al., do not specifically teach an indication of a combination of parts that form the morphologically derived word, the output also including an indication of a part of speech for the combination of parts, and the output also including an indication that the morphological derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent with a morphological pattern of a reduplication type.

Dien et al., teach that no dictionary can be comprehensive enough with all these reduplicatives due to no exhaustive statistics. Here we make use of the rule of morpheme transformation in reduplicatives to identify them....**Those are the words morphologically derived...Therefore, we apply further morphological analysis to easily identify this class of words.** The critical point here is to determine the weight of these derived words [sections 4.1.4, and 4.1.5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made use indication of a combination of parts that form derived words as taught by Dien et al., in Palmer et al., because that would contribute to the segmentation accuracy (Palmer et al., page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

As per claims 64, and 69, Palmer et al., further disclose the output also includes an indication of a named entity detected within the unsegmented text ("Chinese person names"; page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

As per claim 67, Palmer et al., in view of Dien et al., further disclose that said indication that the morphologically derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent

with the morphological pattern of the affixation type is more specifically an indication that the morphological derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent with affixation of a plural affix to a noun (**“those are the words morphologically derived...Similar to English, there appear also prefixes and suffixes, which are however much simpler in the morphology of Vietnamese. Therefore, we apply further morphological analysis to easily identify this class of words”**; section 4.1.5).

As per claim 71, Palmer et al., in view of Dien et al., further disclose that said indication that the morphologically derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent with the morphological pattern of the reduplication type is more specifically an indication that the morphological derived word demonstrates characteristics consistent with transformation of an original word consisting of a pattern of characters into another word also consisting of the pattern of characters (“Here we make use of the rule of morpheme transformation in reduplicatives to identify them...**Those are the words morphologically derived...Therefore, we apply further morphological analysis to easily identify this class of words”**; sections 4.1.4, and 4.1.5).

7. Claims 65, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al., (Chinese Word Segmentation and Information Retrieval; 1997) in view of Dien et al., (Vietnamese Word Segmentation, 2001), and further in view of Guo et al., (US PAP 2002/0052901).

As per claims 65, and 70, Palmer et al., in view of Dien et al., do not specifically teach the output also includes an indication of a factoid detected within the unsegmented text.

Guo et al., teach that for Chinese language, the morphologic process includes the steps of: (1) segmenting sentences into words according to the system dictionary and the user-defined dictionaries; (2) identifying proper names (currently including person names, place names and person titles), domain terms, **numbers, measure words, and date expressions** (paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify factoids as taught by Guo et al., in Palmer et al., because that would contribute to the segmentation accuracy (Palmer et al., page 177, col.2, paragraph 3).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEONARD SAINT CYR whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/662,602

Page 12

Art Unit: 2626

/Richmond Dorvil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626